

for years with these 11 other countries in addition to the United States. We have had strong bipartisan support from Senator STEVENS, a cosponsor of this legislation with me; from Congressman WAYNE GILCHREST from the House side, who has been a leader in this area; from Congressman CUNNINGHAM, who has been very helpful on this. There have been a large number of people and the environmental groups that have recognized this is by far the best opportunity because they see, as I do, these other countries in this area.

I am so distressed that we are wasting this golden opportunity because I think, as other environmental groups think and feel, if we do not enact this treaty, we are going to lose the great progress that has already been made. These countries now that are trying to cooperate are going to lose any incentive to do so. I think, from the gill fishing industry and the sport fishing industry, when these countries see what we are doing to them, they are going to, all of a sudden, say why should we allow you to fish in our waters for marlin and for billfish? They can move in that direction, causing us great problems in those areas, not to mention they would lose their incentive to have observers on their boats, where they now have observers on every tuna boat that reports to the public exactly what happens. If we lose that, do some groups realize what we are losing?

I suggest, in conclusion, we have missed a tremendous opportunity. This is the second time in 1 week I have come to the floor and had to say how unfortunate it is and how saddened I am by the fact we cannot approve agreements this country has entered into in good faith and that we have signed, because some people think they are not perfect. Nothing we do is perfect. But this agreement is a good, solid agreement. It should have been ratified. It should have been approved. Vice President AL GORE was strongly behind it. Responsible environmental groups were strongly behind it. Industry was strongly behind it. It almost makes you ask the question, how can this be?

How unfortunate that is, the situation we are in, and I fear for the consequences in a number of areas, particularly environmental laws, rules, regulations and standards. I think they will come tumbling down as a result of this effort in killing this agreement today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO OUR RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, we are down to sort of the short rows, I guess, of the 104th Congress. We will be saying farewell to about 14 of our colleagues who have chosen to retire from the U.S. Senate, having given a good many years and a good amount of their talents to this country and to this body and, of course, to their constituencies in their respective States.

I have fond memories of every one of them, as I came in 1989 and have been doing business with all of these folks with a great deal of pleasure. But it has not been all pleasure. There has been some bitter with the good. But nonetheless, that is life and that is the legislative process. That is the way it is supposed to be.

I can remember my first speech on the floor of the Senate when I was standing in the Senators' lobby right behind the Senate, and I was a little bit nervous about my first time. Senator SIMPSON of Wyoming, my friend to the south, walked by me and said, "You don't look very good. In fact, you look a little green around the gills and a little pale." I told him, "You know, I've been in the auction business a long time and the public speaking business a long time, and this is the first time I think I've ever really known a little bit of fear." I was apologetic for that. I remember his answer was, "If you weren't a little bit afraid, we'd be worried about you."

He has been a great teacher, Senator SIMPSON. I cannot imagine this U.S. Senate without his presence, without his wit, without his humor, without his approach not only to the legislative process, but his approach to life, because I can remember when we used to have the old off-the-record days and the dialogue between the press and this body, and especially with him and his wife Ann and his family. We will miss them in the Washington scene.

Senator HEFLIN is going back to Alabama—the judge, we call him—who has been a teacher to me on the Energy Committee, facing some of the same kinds of problems in our respective States, even though he comes from the Southeast and I from the West.

Senator KASSEBAUM. NANCY will go home to Kansas. Kind, thoughtful, I did not always agree with everything she espoused, and she with me, but nonetheless I will miss her.

Senator SIMON from Illinois we will miss, with his voice, very distinctive voice in this body. But I think we will also miss the pragmatic way he confronted life in this body and what he could do. He will go home to southern Illinois, and we will miss him.

Senator PELL and his longtime association with foreign policy.

I can remember as a young man traveling for the American Polled Hereford Association, and I had the opportunity to travel to the Pacific Northwest, to Washington and Oregon. I can remember when I went to Oregon, MARK HAT-

FIELD was Governor of that State. I deemed it a great, high honor to serve with him in his capacity both in Energy and Appropriations here, and I thought he was an outstanding Governor of the State of Oregon.

SAM NUNN will be missed. He is the leveling effect on the Armed Services Committee. We have had great shifts ever since the Wall came down in this historic time that he chaired that committee, and also as the ranking member in the last 2 years. But nonetheless, he was the chair when the Wall came down with a tremendous change, a tremendous shift in power, in world politics and in world military might. It happened on his wave. While I was concerned about this Russian situation, can they feed themselves; he was concerned, can they take care of all of the bumps in the road and the landmines that they will encounter while making this great transition from a world power into a market economy and providing more freedom for their people?

Senator BRADLEY, who has roots in Missouri, the same as mine, has done what he thought was right, not what everybody else thought was right.

We will miss DAVID PRYOR because he will go home to his homeland of Arkansas. Quiet, persuasive, knowledgeable, dedicated.

BENNETT JOHNSTON, who was the chairman of the Energy Committee when I first went on the Energy Committee. Again, he had a leveling effect because of the many contentious issues and emotional issues that we are confronted with every day when you come from a State that has a high proportion of public lands where the Government is really your neighbor, in fact the Government is the biggest neighbor you have. Thirty-eight percent of the State of Montana is owned by the U.S. Government.

For some of you who are not aware what it is like to live next to where the Government owns everything, there are times when they are not very good neighbors. Kind of like the fella who moved into your neighborhood, and they asked, "How are the neighbors there?" And he says, "How were they where you come from?" You know, they really do not practice that kind of philosophy sometimes.

But Senator JOHNSTON is one of those people who tries to level out the bumps, take some of the emotion out of it, to at least look at the public lands policy as far as the right thing to do for the land and the right thing for the people, for the people who lived where those lands existed, and the impact it would have on their lives. I appreciate that.

HANK BROWN of Colorado will go home, back to Colorado. I think he probably is one of the most intelligent men in this body, whose mind is so curious and his approach to life is so pragmatic that he will be sorely missed in this body. Probably there are not a lot of folks across the Nation who will really appreciate what he contributed

to the Senate and what he has contributed to the United States of America, because he quietly goes about his way in doing the right thing, and very intelligently.

JIM EXON was the Governor of Nebraska when I was traveling through Nebraska. There again, he is known as one of the outstanding Governors of the State of Nebraska. Nebraska is a diverse State, kind of like Montana, but of course a lot more robust because they have great agriculture across the State with all the different kinds of agriculture, because if you will look at Nebraska, it is pretty long. You have most of the manufacturing, farm manufacturing, which all pertained to agriculture, and the little towns in eastern Nebraska and the great grasslands and the sand hills to the west, and, of course, the North Platte River. I speak of Nebraska with great respect because I happened to have married my wife in Nebraska. I understand those folks. Of course, she comes from ranching people and the livestock industry. So we understand that.

SHEILA FRAHM will not be coming back after we drop the gavel on Congress. She will go back to Kansas, coming from a great part of Kansas, the western part, just about where the next Senator who will speak came from years ago, the able Senator from Pennsylvania.

All of these individuals will be missed for their individual talents and the resources they brought to this body. That is what we are, 100 different minds. We are 100 different methods of approaching different problems that this country faces.

I deem it a great honor to serve in the U.S. Senate with these men and women who we will not see on this floor again when the gavel falls this week. I say to my special friends, and especially to ALAN SIMPSON, who way back in 1988 was part of me getting into this political arena, we do not say goodbye, we just say so long, because even though our trails fork at this juncture in our lives, that is not to say that our trails will not cross in the future again.

I thank them for what they have given this body, for the service to their constituency, but, more importantly, I thank them for their service to the United States of America. It will never be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I may speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT TODAY

Mr. SPECTER. I note no other Senators on the floor, Madam President, on this unusual Saturday session. There are a number of subjects I will address this morning, so I have asked for that period of time.

Madam President, at the outset, I want to express my concern, reserva-

tions, and perhaps objection to the process which is now underway to have an omnibus appropriations bill to fund the Federal Government into the next fiscal period starting Tuesday, October 1, which is being added to a conference report on the Defense appropriations bill.

I am concerned about that because it is an extraordinary procedure, probably never before undertaken in the Senate—at least I have not talked to anyone who knows that it has been undertaken. It totally undercuts the traditional procedures of the U.S. Government under our constitutional mandate on separation of powers. In effect, it drastically alters the rules of the U.S. Senate through what is essentially a procedural device to present to the Senate a conference report where there is a single vote without the opportunity of the Senate to make any amendment.

Now, traditionally and under our rules, a Senator may offer an amendment to any bill at any time with unlimited debate unless cloture is invoked. The Constitution and the rules of the Senate have given that extraordinary power to each Senator in order to slow down the legislative process. When the Constitution was adopted, the Senate was supposed to be the saucer which cooled the tea, the hot tea, as it came from the House of Representatives. Senators were really in a sense ambassadors from each of the sovereign States to the Congress of the United States, where we express the views of a sovereign.

That really is not true anymore, as the authority of the central Government has pretty much taken over and relatively little is left of the 10th amendment on reserving rights to the States. All that is coming back a little with the Supreme Court decision in Lopez, which gives more rights to the States. That is a complicated subject, but while the Federal Government has taken on more and more power, at least the Senate has been a bastion where we could take some time and debate issues. That will be totally gone as we work through the balance of the appropriations process and have only one vote on the conference report. I think that is a real danger to our system.

In a sense, we have only ourselves to blame. As appropriations bills have come to the floor of the U.S. Senate, while Senators have acted within the technical rules, the spirit of the process has, in my judgment, been abused. We have had the Interior appropriations bill, for example, on the floor of the Senate, when we should take up very important matters concerning the national parks and other matters related to forests and the environment. But, instead of dealing with the Interior appropriations bill, Senators have insisted on offering amendments on other subjects, many of them legislative authorizations outside the purview of the appropriations process, with an enor-

mous amount of political gamesmanship and one-upmanship and a real effort to outbid or embarrass the other political party. It is done on both sides. I do not say this in the context of criticizing the other party.

The subcommittee which I chair on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education never even had its bill come to the Senate floor because it was anticipated that it would be very contentious and that many diverse amendments would be offered. At least it has been my hope and the hope of Senator HARKIN, the ranking Democrat, that we would have a chance to bring the bill to the floor. Instead, the bidding war on education started on the Interior appropriations bill. That is why the Interior appropriations bill was pulled down.

Last year's budget, which we should have finished on September 30, 1995, was not finished until late April 1996. On that bill earlier this year, Senator HARKIN and I came forward with a bipartisan approach to add \$2.7 billion so we could have adequate funding on Education and on Health and Human Services and on Labor, where a big issue was worker safety.

We have found within the appropriations process itself, that the subcommittee chair and the ranking members have been able to work on a harmonious basis and really get the job done in the kind of collegiality and a relationship that develops when you work with an individual and move ahead. Just as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Senator BOB KERREY, and I have done on the Intelligence Committee, where I serve as chair and Senator KERREY serves as vice chair. We have had very contentious issues which have potential partisan overtones, some fierce matters there that we have kept under wraps.

We are still working on that, as a matter of fact, in the closing days of the Congress. We have done that because of our concern, shared by the Intelligence Committee members generally and by the distinguished presiding officer, who is a member, because of our view that a bipartisan and non-partisan approach to intelligence matters and comprehending foreign affairs is very important for the welfare of the country. And as I say, the subcommittee chairs have done that. Senator HATFIELD made a report yesterday to the Republican caucus identifying quite a number of chairmen and ranking members who have been able to work it out on a harmonious basis, which is the essence of compromise in a democracy, to get it done. But when the matters come to the floor, and 100 Senators are present, the temptation has been, so far, irresistible to add so many items to the appropriations bills that bills have had to be pulled down.

The Appropriations Committee has become even more powerful. There are always comments about the "powerful Appropriations Committee." It has become even more powerful because, at